

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
Southern District of Indiana

United States of America
v.

CHARLES T. BLACK, JR.

Date of Original Judgment: 01/15/2013
Date of Previous Amended Judgment: _____
(Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Any)

Case No: 1:11CR00083-001

USM No: 10055-028

Pro Se

Defendant's Attorney

**ORDER REGARDING MOTION FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION
PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)**

Upon motion of ☒ the defendant ☐ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking into account the policy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10 and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent that they are applicable,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:

☒ **DENIED.** ☐ **GRANTED** and the defendant's previously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in the last judgment issued) of _____ months **is reduced to** _____.

(Complete Parts I and II of Page 2 when motion is granted)

Because of the defendant was convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) and was determined to be a career offender, the applicable guideline range was not lowered as a result of the changes to the Drug Quantity Table at §2D1.1. Therefore, he is not eligible for a sentence reduction pursuant to Amendment 782.

Except as otherwise provided, all provisions of the judgment dated _____ shall remain in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Order Date: Date: 1/30/2019

Effective Date: _____
(if different from order date)



Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana